

million dollars to support the growth, export, advertising, overseas financing, and grading of a product which just 18 months ago the Congress determined was so hazardous to health it should not be advertised over the broadcast media and every package of which should be labeled with a health warning.

When young people look to their Government, what do they see these days. Beyond the disillusionment which may have been created by the Pentagon papers, and the administration's efforts to stop the press from revealing the Pentagon papers, the young people of our country see a Government confused and distorted on many issues. We pass legislation to prevent pollution and then for years we permit pollution to continue. We pass legislation calling for packaging of hazardous materials so that thousands of youngsters will not be poisoned each year, and we see the products which caused these poisonings still on the market, still in the same unsafe packages. And we tell our children not to smoke, that it is unsafe to their health, yet we spend millions of dollars encouraging farmers to grow the very product which has been condemned by every medical organization which has looked into smoking and its effects on health.

Mr. President, the question is not, "How can we terminate assistance to hard-working farmers struggling to make a decent income?" The true question which this Congress must face is, "How can we afford to encourage the growing of a crop which will lead to the death of thousands of Americans?"

The second amendment which we are proposing today, would create a Commission on Tobacco Adjustment Assistance to conduct a study and recommend to the Congress action necessary to provide assistance to those individuals adversely affected by the elimination of subsidies caused by the decrease in tobacco consumption currently underway in the United States. The need for this second amendment is perhaps even greater if we are truly concerned about the welfare of our people.

I would think that those Senators whose constituency makes up that part of the Nation we call tobacco country, would support this amendment and its passage. The need is great. The poundage of tobacco which can be sold on the free market is dropping as more and more people become aware of the health hazards of cigarettes. With the elimination of the crop support subsidies, and the elimination of the export subsidies, the income to the 600,000 farm families who make their livelihood on tobacco will surely drop. It is for these reasons that we offer this amendment to help those economically displaced by the current trend toward reduced use of tobacco.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AN AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 159

At the request of Mr. SAXBE, the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE), the Senator from Rhode

Island (Mr. PASTOR), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PRILL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROY), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BOGGS), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIER), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RUMICOFF) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 159, intended to be proposed to S. 1657, the International Security Assistance Act of 1971.

#### NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON BILLS RELATIVE TO ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I wish to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that on July 15, 1971, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will hold an open hearing on S. 291 and S. 2034. Both measures would establish within the Department of the Interior the position of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

S. 2034 was submitted and recommended by the Department of the Interior and would assign to the new Assistant Secretary supervision over the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Office of Territories. S. 291, sponsored by the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), would assign to the new Assistant Secretary supervision over Indian Affairs.

The hearings will begin at 10 a.m. in room 3110, New Senate Office Building.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF MIRV-ABM HEARINGS JULY 13-14

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, tomorrow, the Arms Control Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will begin 2 days of hearings to explore the question of whether the continued deployment of MIRV and ABM systems is necessary at this time.

How can this question be answered? The administration speaks of a "sufficiency" criterion for calculating our strategic requirements. We want to know: sufficient for what? All of us are agreed that our defense must be sufficient to deter an adversary from attacking us. But some critics are concerned that our defense may be excessive—and excessive programs can be costly, and they may have the effect of provoking

the Soviet Union into accelerating their own defense program in order to prevent us from maintaining a decisive strategic superiority. The result can be an endless, spiraling arms race that is not costly but dangerous. How, then, do we plan a defense program that is sufficient but not excessive?

Our decision to deploy MIRV and ABM systems is frequently criticized as an example of excessive defense. MIRV was originally justified as a means of penetrating Soviet ABM defenses. It now appears that the Moscow ABM system is clearly unworkable. Was our reaction appropriate to the threat? What is the present and potential effectiveness of Soviet ABM defenses? Are the fears of a possible upgrading of Soviet air defenses—SAM's—into ballistic missile defenses realistic? Is this possible threat of a workable Soviet ABM the only reason for our MIRV program, or are there other reasons as well?

We will want to explore these questions in order to clarify the rationale for our MIRV programs.

Likewise, our Safeguard ABM program was justified by the administration as a counter to the Soviet SS-9 missile and potential Soviet MIRV capabilities. These Soviet weapons have been portrayed as a lethal threat to our land-based Minuteman missiles—thus provoking fears of a rapidly developing Soviet first-strike capability. Yet the press has reported recently that a new CIA study draws conclusions about SS-9 accuracy and current Soviet MIRV capabilities which suggest that the threat to Minuteman may not be immediate. Perhaps, as many critics argue, our reaction—building ABM defenses for Minuteman bases—was premature. The subcommittee will want to know, therefore, the real answers on the SS-9 and Soviet MIRV potential.

All of these questions are very difficult. The answers depend as much on the judgment of statesmen as on the facts of existing weapons programs and the best estimates of future capabilities. But we must strive to make the soundest judgments possible. We must provide for our national security, but we must also control the arms race.

The executive branch has impressive resources of information with which to make these judgments. But it is not immune to the possibility of error. Congress has the constitutional authority to provide funds for our national defense. It also has the responsibility to subject proposed defense programs to the closest possible scrutiny. We hope to give MIRV and ABM the closest possible scrutiny in these hearings. We want to have clearer answers to this question: Why is the continued deployment of MIRV and ABM necessary at this time?

#### NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON PEACE CORPS AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Foreign Relations has scheduled a hearing on July 16, 1971, on the Peace Corps authorization bill at which I expect to explore the implications of the Peace